

Appl. No. 09/752,360
Amdt. dated July 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action of March 1, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 and 12-13 were said to be allowable. Claims 12-13 are rewritten in independent form to secure their allowance.

Claims 14-22 were withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention as stated in the Office Action.

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Hattori 5,981,305 on the grounds set forth in the Office Action.

The following argument is presented to overcome the grounds of rejection with respect to the rejection of claim 10 and its dependent claim 11 under 35 USC 102.

An important feature of the present invention, as set forth in amended claim 10, is that the final film 2 consists of single layer or multi layer deposited films 2a in the present invention.

This definition for layer structure of the deposited film 2a is described page 8 third paragraph of the specification.

In contrast with the present invention, Hattori relates to the reinforcing of the film 15 of the ultra fine particle in which the other supporting substrate 18 is applied on the

rear surface of the film via an adhesive layer 17. Also a planarizing of the film 15 is performed to fix the supporting substrate 18 on rear surface of the film after planarizing the emitter (film) layer 15 or adhesive layer 17. After fixing the supporting substrate 18 to the film 15, the first support substrate 10, the low melting point material layer 11 and the sacrificial film 13 are removed to bare the top surface of the film.

Thus Hattori does not teach technology for improvement of quality of the ultra fine particle film, but teaches technology for improving the adhesive character of the surface of film or of adhesive layer to supporting substrate. Further the surface for which the planarization is performed in the present invention is the top surface of the film, but that is the rear surface in Hattori. Further, Hattori doesn't disclose the feature of the present invention that the final film 2 consists of single layer or multi layer deposited films 2a in the present invention.

Further comments on Hattori appear in the Remarks of the previous response. Accordingly this argument and Amendment are believed to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 102 so as to obtain allowance of claims 10 and 11.

In the event there are further issues remaining in any respect the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone attorney to reach agreement to expedite issuance of this application.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Deposit Account charge forms are presented in the amount of \$172 for 2 extra independent form claims in excess of 3 independent form claims.

A two month extension until August 1, 2004 is requested in a separate paper.

Since the present claims set forth the present invention patentably and distinctly, and are not taught by the cited art either taken alone or in combination, this amendment is believed to place this case in condition for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the matter, enter this amendment, and to allow all of the claims in this case.

Respectfully submitted
Jun Akedo

by: MARTIN A. FARBER
Attorney for Applicant
Registered Representative
Registration No.: 22,345

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the accompanying Amendment Upon Final Rejection and Deposit Account Charge are being facsimile transmitted to the Patent Office on July 12, 2004.

Signed by Martin A. Farber

Dated: July 12, 2004

866 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
(212) 758-2878